



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ment most "strongly against the grantor," 2 PERRY, TRUSTS, p. 1188. Another justification is that of *Biscoe v. Jackson*, 35 Ch. Div. 460 (1887), where Mr. Justice Kay said that if the mode of applying the gift could be separated from the intent, then the intent should be taken to be a general gift to a charity. (Cited with approval in 4 MICH. L. REV. 287.) It is to be observed that the dissenting judges based their position on a strict interpretation such as would govern an ordinary private contract.

WILLS—REVOCATION—UNDUE INFLUENCE.—In a case which is reported as a syllabus only, the Georgia Court of Appeals held, that "The fact that the deceased had made a will and had been intimidated into destroying it is not relevant, upon an application for administration upon the estate of the deceased, to negative the fact of intestacy; and such evidence was properly excluded." *Pate v. Pate* (Ga. App.), 113 S. E. 50.

This holding seems to find no support either in principle or authority. PAGE, WILLS, §§ 256-257; GARDNER, WILLS (Ed. 2), pp. 231-2; JARMAN, WILLS (Ed. 6), pp. 145 *et seq.* "Substantially as much capacity is required to revoke a will as to make one." GARDNER, op. cit., p. 232. And the revocation, like the execution, of a will is vitiated by insanity of the testator, by undue influence ("intimidation"), etc., inducing the revocation. Insanity undue influence, etc., are matter of fact dehors the will or its revocation; hence, unless these vitiating circumstances are to be ignored entirely in connection with revocation, parol evidence must be admitted in this class of cases in order to prove (as was sought to be done in the principal case) that the mere physical destruction of his will by a testator is not the product of the free will of a competent actor, is not accompanied, in the legal sense, by *animus revocandi*, is not, in short, the revocatory act that it seems to be.